

## REMARKS

These Remarks, made pursuant to a thorough review of the Office Action and the references cited therein, are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action's rejections and/or objections. Applicant does not acquiesce to any portion of the Office Action not particularly addressed herein. All claims pending upon entry of this Response are believed to be patentable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that claims 2-3 and 9-10 contain allowable subject matter. Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 2, which is cancelled.

The specification has been amended to remove the hyperlinks that were objected to. Withdrawal of the objections to the specification are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Neff et al., *Very Low Bit Rate Video Coding Based on Matching Pursuits* in view of Frossard et al, *A Posteriori Quantized Matching Pursuit*. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments made to independent claim 1, which incorporate the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 2 therein. Claims 3 – 10 are believed to be allowable over this combination of references at least by virtue of their dependencies on allowable independent claim 1, as well as for their added features.

Claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Neff et al., *Very Low Bit Rate Video Coding Based on Matching Pursuits* in view of Frossard et al, *A Posteriori Quantized Matching Pursuit* in view of Well Known Prior Art (Official Notice). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments made to independent claim 1. Claims 7-8 are believed to be allowable over this combination of references at least by virtue of their dependencies on allowable independent claim 1, as well as for their added features. Because Applicant has amended claim 1 to place the application in condition for allowance, it is not necessary to traverse (or to request citation to one or more prior art references that substantiate) the statements of Official Notice set forth in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant does not acquiesce that such statements are true or proper.

#### Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance

Although Applicant believes that each of claims 2-3 and 9-10 is allowable over the prior art of record (and/or combinations thereof) based on their respective features, Applicant does not acquiesce that patentability resides in each feature, exactly as expressed in each of the claims or exactly as expressed in the Statement of Reasons for Allowance (on page 7 of the Office Action), nor that each feature is required for patentability.

#### CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for claims 1 and 3-10 is therefore earnestly solicited.

Applicant's failure (if at all) to expressly address above any particular statement or argument by the Examiner should not be construed as an admission or acquiescence that such statement or argument is accurate or proper.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_/jet50352/\_\_\_\_\_  
Jonathan E. Thomas  
Reg. No. 50,352  
Attorney for Applicant

General Electric Company  
Global Patent Operation  
2 Corporate Drive, Suite 648  
Shelton, CT 06484  
T: (203) 944-6747  
F: (203) 761-6712